

Federal district courts are expressly required, under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B), to screen all *in forma pauperis* actions, and to dismiss before service any such action that the court determines is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from defendant who is immune from such relief. *See Hill v. Lappin*, 630

F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010).

This action must be summarily dismissed.

The plaintiff's complaint does not set forth a claim that is arguably plausible under the First Amendment's Petition Clause. *See, e.g., Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999) (holding the plaintiff's claims against government officials, alleging that they violated his First Amendment right to petition government because they did not answer his letters or take action he requested, not arguably plausible and subject to *sua sponte* dismissal).

Moreover, none of the defendants may be sued for the relief the plaintiff seeks under *Bivens*. *See, e.g., Sibley v. U.S. Supreme Court*, 786 F. Supp. 2d 338 (D.D.C. 2011) (dismissing action for declaratory relief and damages against the United States Supreme Court and its Deputy Clerk, among others).

Conclusion

Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2) is granted, and this action is summarily dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B). The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 7, 2017

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE